

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SAUNDRA L. LANGLEY,

Defendant and Appellant.

D037950

(Super. Ct. No. SCD130964)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, David M. Szumowski, Judge. Affirmed.

On June 17, 1998, Sandra L. Langley entered a negotiated guilty plea to selling or furnishing cocaine base. (Health & Saf. Code, § 11352, subd. (a).) The court suspended imposition of sentence and placed her on three years' probation. On May 15, 1999, the court revoked probation and on June 17, 1999, reinstated probation. On April 19, 2001, Langley admitted violating a probation condition and the court again revoked and reinstated probation, including a condition she serve 365 days in custody.

The grant of probation was conditioned on Langley waiving all conduct credit. (Pen. Code, § 4019.)

DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief setting forth the evidence in the superior court. Counsel presents no argument for reversal but asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 counsel refers to as possible but not arguable issues: (1) whether Langley knowingly and intelligently waived her right to an evidentiary hearing and whether her admission was valid; and (2) whether Langley validly waived her past and future local conduct credit.¹

We granted Langley permission to file a brief on her own behalf. She has not responded. A review of the entire record pursuant to *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, including the possible issues referred to pursuant to *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issue. Competent counsel has represented Langley on this appeal.

¹ Because Langley entered a guilty plea, she cannot challenge the facts underlying the conviction. (Pen. Code, § 1237.5; *People v. Martin* (1973) 9 Cal.3d 687, 693; *People v. Jackson* (1985) 37 Cal.3d 826, 836, overruled on other grounds as recognized in *People v. Burton* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 843, 863.) We need not recite the facts.

DISPOSITION

Judgment affirmed.

KREMER, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

HUFFMAN, J.

O'ROURKE, J.